

Applicant : Bill Shapiro et al.  
Serial No. : 10/659,874  
Filed : September 9, 2003  
Page : 15 of 17

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-609001 / P562

### REMARKS

Claims 1-54 are pending. Claims 1, 14, 27, 28, 41, and 54 are independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 14, 27, 28, 32, 41, and 54 are currently amended. Claims 17 and 44 are cancelled. No new matter is added. Support for the amended claims may be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 8, lines 15-24, page 10, lines 12- 31, and page 11, lines 1-8. Reconsideration of the action mailed January 22, 2007, is respectfully requested in light of the claim amendments and the comments below.

Claims 14-17, 19-21, 23-27, 41-44, 46-48, and 50-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0237005 ("Bar-Or"). Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 28-30, 32-36, and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bar-Or in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0117655 ("Someshwar"). Claims 4, 10, 18, 31, 37 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bar-Or and Someshwar and in further view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0195585 A1 ("Ram").

### Section 102 Rejections

#### Claims 14, 27, 41 and 54

The examiner rejected claims 14, 27, 41 and 54 over Bar-Or. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The applicant notes that while Bar-Or teaches a method and system for accessing electronic documents distributed over a network, Bar-Or does not access electronic documents in the same manner as claimed by the applicant.

The applicant's claim language, as amended, requires the receipt of a voucher incorporating both a set of access policies for controlling access to an encrypted rendition of an electronic document as well as an electronic key operable to decrypt the encrypted rendition of the electronic document. Bar-Or discloses sending a decryption key for the electronic document. See Paragraph 49. However, Bar-Or does not disclose or suggest that the voucher includes the set of access policies for the electronic document. The examiner relies upon a secondary

Applicant : Bill Shapiro et al.  
Serial No. : 10/659,874  
Filed : September 9, 2003  
Page : 16 of 17

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-609001 / P562

reference (Someshwar) to teach the claimed set of access policies. The applicant respectfully disagrees, as will be discussed below in reference to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 14, 27, 41 and 54, as amended, are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### Section 103 Rejections

#### Claims 1 and 28

The examiner has rejected claims 1 and 28 over Bar-Or and Someshwar. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

The examiner acknowledges that Bar-Or does not disclose or suggest a voucher that includes a set of access policies for the electronic document. The examiner relies upon Someshwar to teach the claimed set of access policies for the electronic document. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, claim 1, as amended, recites creating a voucher including the set of access policies for controlling access to the encrypted rendition of the electronic document, the voucher further including an electronic key operable to decrypt the encrypted rendition of the electronic document. Additionally, claim 1 further recites that the set of access policies include access policies for a plurality of users. Thus, the voucher includes the set of access policies for more than one user.

In Someshwar, each time a user requests permission to print a document, the printing software retrieves the specified document and contacts a policy server to request a decryption key for the document as well as access rules for the particular user for that particular document. *See* paragraphs 0036 and 0037. Thus, in Someshwar, the decryption key and access rules for the document pertain only to a specific user. Consequently, for each user, the policy server identifies a particular access policy corresponding to the requesting user and sends that particular policy. However, Someshwar does not disclose or suggest creating a voucher including a set of access policies where the set of access policies include access policies for a plurality of users. The applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 28 are allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant : Bill Shapiro et al.  
Serial No. : 10/659,874  
Filed : September 9, 2003  
Page : 17 of 17

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-609001 / P562

Remaining Claims

The applicant requests reconsideration of the remaining dependent claims, as the depend from the independent claims noted above and are thus allowable for at least the reasons which apply to the respective independent claims from which they depend.

**Conclusion**

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 23 April, 2007

*Arrièenne M. Lezak* Brian Gruenthal  
Reg. No. 51,943 Reg. No. 51,978 for,

Customer Number 21876  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50398914.doc